

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/533,685	03/23/2000	Michael Lee Hearn	600.1040	9876	
23280 7	590 06/21/2007		EXAM	EXAMINER	
-	DAVIDSON & KAI I AVENUE, 14TH FLO		-		
NEW YORK,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,					

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2007

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (37 CFR 41.37)

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/533,685	HEARN, MICHAEL LEE	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Kenneth E. Peterson	3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on <u>02 April 2007</u> is defective for fa	lure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.
--	---

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file anamended brief or other appropriate correction (see MPEP 1205.03) within ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.

1. 🗌	The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. 🗌	The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).
3. 🗌	At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).
4.	(a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).
5. 🛚	The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi))
6. 🛛	The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).
7.	The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).
8.	The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner <b>and relied upon by appellant in the appeal</b> , along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).
9. 🗌	The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR $41.37(c)(1)(x)$ ).
10.🛛	Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):
	In regards to item 5 above, Appellant's recitation of the last three rejections omitted that they can include the Henc and Sauer references.  In regards to item 6 above, there is no argument for the rejection set forth for in paragraph 10 of the final rejection, namely Marcus in view of Wolfberg, Henc and Sauer.  As always, Applicant should feel free to call Exemples and discuss uses to structurally asset to the structural transfer.

<u>As always, Applicant should feel free to call Examiner and discuss ways to structurally amend the claims to </u> overcome the prior art rejections.

> KENNETH E. PETERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER